[PROPOSED] ORDER

Having considered Defendant Google LLC's Administrative Motion to Seal Materials Submitting in Connection with Google's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification and the Declaration of Mara Boundy in support thereof, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Defendant's Administrative Motion to Seal is **GRANTED** as follows:

Justification for Sealing

To Class Cert. Motion	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
Redacted	These portions of Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Class	Seal proposed
portions of	Certification Motion disclose strategic decisions	redactions
pages 1, 4-5	related to Google's internal testing processes, procedures, the confidential analysis undertaken by Google to ascertain the cause of microphone issues experienced by certain customers, as well as the results of internal testing (by Google and HTC) and analysis of the Pixels, which includes disclosure of Google's return data and failure rate projections for the Pixels. This information is proprietary and confidential to Google. These portions of the Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Class Certification Motion also disclose confidential technical details relating to Google's proposed and actual corrective action(s) taken with respect to the Pixels. Public disclosure of this confidential information would harm Google's competitive standing because its competitors would benefit from unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy, evaluation, testing	redactions
	methodologies, testing results, and internal problem- solving procedures, which would enable them to	
	unfairly compete with Google.	
Redacted portions of pages 6, 8, 11, 15, 24-25	These portions of Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Class Certification Motion disclose strategic decisions related to Google's internal testing processes and procedures, the confidential analysis undertaken by Google to ascertain the cause of microphone issues experienced by certain customers, as well as the results of Google's internal testing and analysis of the Pixels. These portions of the Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Class Certification Motion also disclose confidential technical details relating to Google's proposed and actual corrective action(s) taken with respect to the Pixels. The results of Google's confidential analysis and the related technical details reveal Google's research efforts and technical know-	Seal proposed redactions
[DD OD O	SEDI ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAL MA	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Google's Opp. To Class Cert. Motion	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
	how relating to the Pixels, which is proprietary business information.	

6	Exhibits to	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
7	Declaration of		
7	Bobbie Wilson		
8	ISO Google's		
	Opp. to Plaintiffs'		
9	Motion ("Wilson		
10	Decl.")		
	Redacted portions	James Dep. at 82:9-11 and 14-25 reveals	Seal proposed
11	of Ex. 5 (excerpts	confidential details relating to the confidential	redactions
12	of the transcript	analysis undertaken by Google to ascertain the	
12	of the deposition	cause of microphone issues experienced certain	
13	of Steven James,	customers. The results of Google's confidential	
14	Google's 30(b)(6) witness, taken on	analysis disclose Google's research efforts and technical know-how relating to the Pixels, which is	
17	August 30, 2018	proprietary business information. Public disclosure	
15	("James Dep.")):	of this confidential information would harm	
1.0	(************************************	Google's competitive standing because its	
16	82:9-11, 14-25	competitors would benefit from unwarranted	
17		insight into Google's product strategy, evaluation,	
		testing methodologies, testing results, and internal	
18		problem-solving procedures, which would enable	
19		them to unfairly compete with Google.	
17	D 1 . 1	T D 110111115 05 110 141 150 10	G 1 1
20	Redacted portions	James Dep. at 112:1-11, 15-25, 113, 141, 150:1-3,	Seal proposed
21	of Ex. 5 (excerpts of the James Dep.	6-25, 156:2-18, and 157:7-25 contains confidential information relating to the confidential analysis	redactions
21	transcript):	undertaken by Google to ascertain the cause of	
22	transcript).	microphone issues experienced by certain	
	112:1-11, 15-25;	customers. The results of Google's confidential	
23	113; 141; 150:1-	analysis disclose Google's research efforts and	
24	3, 6-25; 156:2-18;	technical know-how relating to the Pixels, which is	
	157:7-25	proprietary business information. Public disclosure	
25		of these details could harm Google's competitive	
26		standing because its competitors could benefit from	
20		unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy,	
27		testing results, and internal problem-solving procedures, which would enable them to unfairly	
20		compete with Google.	
28		D) ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAL MA	
	CONNECTION WITH	H GOOGLE'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR	CLASS CERTIFICATION:

1 2	Exhibits to Declaration of Bobbie Wilson	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
3	ISO Google's Opp. to		
4	Plaintiffs'		
5	Motion ("Wilson Decl.")		
6	,		
7 8	Ex. 6 (GOOG- WEEKS- 00002967-2969)	GOOG-WEEKS-00002967-2969 contain confidential information relating to the confidential analysis undertaken by Google to ascertain the cause of microphone issues experienced by certain	Seal proposed redactions
9		customers. The results of Google's confidential analysis disclose Google's research efforts and	
10		technical know-how relating to the Pixels, which is proprietary business information. Public disclosure	
11		of these details could harm Google's competitive standing because its competitors could benefit from	
12		unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy, testing results, and internal problem-solving	
13 14		procedures, which would enable them to unfairly compete with Google.	
15	Ex. 7 (GOOG-	GOOG-WEEKS-00200111 reveals confidential	Seal proposed
	WEEKS-	strategic decisions related to marketing and pricing	redactions
16 17	00200111)	of the Pixels. Public disclosure of this sensitive business information would harm Google's	
18		competitive standing because it would give competitors unwarranted insight into Google's	
19		marketing and pricing strategies, allowing them to unfairly benefit from Google's know-how and the	
20		resources it expended to launch and promote the Pixel.	
21	Ex. 10 (GOOG-	GOOG-WEEKS-00191668 – 00191672 reveal	Seal proposed
22	WEEKS- 00191668 –	confidential strategic decisions related to marketing of the Pixels. Public disclosure of this sensitive	redactions
23	00191608 =	business information would harm Google's competitive standing because it would give	
24		competitive standing because it would give competitors unwarranted insight into Google's	
25		marketing strategies, allowing them to unfairly	
26		benefit from Google's know-how and the resources it expended to launch and promote the Pixel.	
27	Ex. 11 (GOOG-	GOOG-WEEKS-00191668 – 00191672 reveal	Seal proposed
28	WEEKS-	confidential strategic decisions related to marketing DI ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAL MA	redactions

1	Exhibits to	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
2	Declaration of Bobbie Wilson		
3	ISO Google's		
	Opp. to		
4	Plaintiffs' Motion ("Wilson		
5	Decl.")		
6	00191664 –	of the Pixels. Public disclosure of this sensitive	
	00191667)	business information would harm Google's competitive standing because it would give	
7		competitive standing because it would give competitors unwarranted insight into Google's	
8		marketing strategies, allowing them to unfairly	
9		benefit from Google's know-how and the resources it expended to launch and promote the Pixel.	
		it expended to fautien and promote the rixer.	
10	Ex. 12 (GOOG-	GOOG-WEEKS-00191659 – 00191663 reveal	Seal proposed
11	WEEKS- 00191659 –	confidential strategic decisions related to marketing of the Pixels. Public disclosure of this sensitive	redactions
12	00191663)	business information would harm Google's	
13		competitive standing because it would give	
		competitors unwarranted insight into Google's marketing strategies, allowing them to unfairly	
14		benefit from Google's know-how and the resources	
15		it expended to launch and promote the Pixel.	
16	Ex. 18 (GOOG-	GOOG-WEEKS-00000031 – 33 contains personal	Seal proposed
17	WEEKS-	contact information of Plaintiffs. Google files it	redactions
	00000031 - 33	provisionally under seal pursuant to Local Rule 79-	
18		5.	
19	Ex. 19 (PL00118-	PL00118-121 contains personal information of	Seal proposed
20	121)	Plaintiff Adrian Alcaraz. Google files it	redactions
		provisionally under seal pursuant to Local Rule 79-5.	
21	Ex. 20 (PL00021-	PL00021-24 contains personal information of	Seal proposed
22	24)	Plaintiff Brian McCloy. Google files it	redactions
23		provisionally under seal pursuant to Local Rule 79-5.	
	Ex. 22 (GOOG-	GOOG-WEEKS-00215087 – 00215166 is a	Seal proposed
24	WEEKS-	confidential and proprietary purchase and sale	redactions
25	00215087 – 00215166)	agreement between Google and nonparty Verizon Wireless, which discloses details related to	
26		competitive strategies, strategic planning, pricing,	
27		and product requirements governing Google's	
		supply and Verizon's sale of the Pixel5-	
28		D] ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAL MAT H GOOGLE'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR	

1	Exhibits to	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
2	Declaration of Bobbie Wilson		
3	ISO Google's		
4	Opp. to Plaintiffs'		
5	Motion ("Wilson Decl.")		
6		Public disclosure of this confidential and	
7		proprietary information would harm Google's competitive standing because its competitors would benefit from unwarrented insight into Google's	
8		benefit from unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy, pricing, and negotiated contract	
9		provisions which would enable them to unfairly compete with Google.	
10	Redacted portions	These portions of Ex. 24 reveal confidential	Seal proposed
11	of Ex. 24 (Martin Report) ¶¶ 4, 6,	information related to Google's strategic pricing decisions related to the sale of the Pixels. Public	redactions
12	10(b), 26, 27, 34 (& n.57), 46(a),	disclosure of this confidential information would harm Google's competitive standing because its	
13	46(b), 55, 57(c)	competitors would benefit from unwarranted insight into Google's product pricing strategy,	
14 15		which would enable them to unfairly compete with Google.	
16		Furthermore, these portions of Ex. 24 contain	
17		information derived from documents Google has designated as "Confidential" or "Highly-	
18		Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only" pursuant to	
19		the parties' Stipulated Protective Order, because of the competitively-sensitive content of those	
20		documents.	
21	Redacted portions of Ex. 24 (Martin	These portions of Ex. 24 reveal and rely upon confidential information produced by non-party	Seal proposed redactions
22	Report) ¶¶ 4, 6, 10(b), 34 (&	Verizon Wireless. Although Google moves to seal each of these paragraphs itself due to the harm	
23	n.57), 46(a), 55,	public disclosure would cause it (as set forth	
24	57(c)	above), Google also moves to file these paragraphs provisionally under seal, pursuant to Civil L.R. 79-	
25		5, as revealing confidential information of a nonparty.	
26		- 1	~ 1
27	Redacted portions of Ex. 26	These portions of Ex. 26 reveal confidential details about the composition and design of the Pixels.	Seal proposed redactions
28	(Madisetti	Public disclosure of this confidential information DI ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAL MAT	redial c clidwitter in

T 1014: .	Y 1100 11 22 22 33	
Exhibits to Declaration of Bobbie Wilson	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
ISO Google's		
Opp. to		
Plaintiffs' Motion ("Wilson		
Decl.")		
Report) at page i, ¶¶ 34, 40-43, 45	would harm Google's competitive standing because its competitors would gain unwarranted insight into	
II II 7 7	the technical product specifications of the Pixel, which would enable competitors to unfairly benefit	
	from the resources and research Google expended	
	to launch the Pixels.	
Redacted portions of Ex. 26	This portion of Ex. 26 reveals confidential details relating to the Purchase and Sale Agreement	Seal proposed redactions
Madisetti Report) at ¶ 56	between Google and Verizon Wireless, the details of which, if revealed, would harm Google's	
r , 0 0	competitive standing because its competitors would receive unwarranted insight into the confidential	
	agreement between Google and its authorized reseller, which would enable competitors to	
	unfairly benefit from the negotiated terms of a	
	business contract entered into to sell the Pixels.	
Redacted portions of Ex. 26	These portions of Ex. 26 reveal confidential details about the composition and design of the Main	Seal proposed redactions
Madisetti	Logic Board ("MLB") of the Pixels. Public	reductions
Report) at ¶¶ 58, 59 (& n.20), 60	disclosure of this confidential information would harm Google's competitive standing because its	
(& n.21), 61 (&	competitors would gain unwarranted insight into	
n.22), 62, 63 (& n.24), 64 (&	the technical product specifications of the Pixel, which would enable competitors to unfairly benefit	
n.25), 65, 66 (& n.26), 85 (& n.50)	from the resources and research Google expended to launch the Pixels.	
Dadaatad aa wa' a w	These mentions of En. 26 marrel and 1 and 1 and 1	Cool mass as a 1
Redacted portions of Ex. 26	These portions of Ex. 26 reveal confidential details relating to the pre-release testing performed on the	Seal proposed redactions
(Madisetti Report) at ¶ 67	Pixels, including identification of specific tests that were performed and the results of those tests. These	
(image only), ¶	portions rely on Exhibit A to the Declaration of Steven James in Support of Google's Opposition to	
	Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification ("James	
	Decl."). Public disclosure of Ex. A, James Decl. could harm Google's competitive standing because	
	it would provide competitors unwarranted insight	

1	Exhibits to	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
2	Declaration of Bobbie Wilson		0
3	ISO Google's		
4	Opp. to Plaintiffs'		
	Motion ("Wilson		
5	Decl.")		
6		into the results of pre-release testing of the Pixel, product development and strategy, and other	
7		proprietary information regarding the production of the Pixel, which would allow competitors to	
8		unfairly benefit from Google's know-how,	
9		research, and resources expended to launch the Pixels.	
10		Google moves to seal Ex. A., James Decl. for the	
11		reasons described below.	
12	Redacted portions	Paragraph 73 of the Madisetti report relies on	Seal proposed
13	of Ex. 26 (Madisetti	redacted portions of the James Decl. and its Exhibit B, which disclose the results of Google's internal	redactions
14	Report) at ¶ 73	testing and analysis of the Pixels, Google's return	
		data, and Google's failure rate projections for the	
15		Pixels. This information is proprietary and confidential to Google. Public disclosure of this	
16		confidential information would harm Google's	
17		competitive standing because its competitors would	
		benefit from unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy, evaluation, testing methodologies,	
18		testing results, and internal problem-solving	
19		procedures, which would enable them to unfairly	
20		compete with Google.	
21	Redacted portions	These portions of Ex. 26 reveal confidential details	Seal proposed
	of Ex. 26 (Madisetti	about the composition and design of the Pixels and also disclose strategic decisions related to Google's	redactions
22	Report) at	internal testing processes and procedures, the	
23	heading "G", ¶¶	confidential analysis undertaken by Google to	
24	75, 76 (& n.40), 77 (& n.41), 79-	ascertain the cause of microphone issues experienced by certain customers, as well as the	
25	84, 86-88, 93-94,	results of Google's internal testing and analysis of	
	heading "I", 95-	the Pixels.	
26	98.	Public disclosure of this confidential information	
27		would harm Google's competitive standing because	
28	[DDODOGE	its competitors would gain unwarranted insight into	EEDIAL COUDAITEED DA

1	Exhibits to	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
2	Declaration of Bobbie Wilson		
3	ISO Google's		
4	Opp. to Plaintiffs'		
	Motion ("Wilson		
5	Decl.")	the technical was but an exist actions of the Divel	
6		the technical product specifications of the Pixel, which would enable competitors to unfairly benefit	
7		from the resources and research Google expended	
8		to launch the Pixels. Public disclosure of this confidential information would also harm Google's	
9		competitive standing because it would allow its	
		competitors to benefit from unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy, evaluation, testing	
10		methodologies, testing results, and internal	
11		problem-solving procedures, which would enable them to unfairly compete with Google.	
12		, ,	
13	Redacted portions of Ex. 26	This portion of Ex. 26 discloses confidential technical details relating to Google's proposed and	Seal proposed redactions
14	(Madisetti	actual corrective action(s) taken with respect to the	
15	Report) at ¶ 78.	Pixels. The results of Google's confidential analysis and the related technical details reveal Google's	
		research efforts and technical know-how relating to	
16		the Pixels, which is proprietary business information.	
17			
18		Public disclosure of this confidential information would harm Google's competitive standing because	
19		its competitors would benefit from unwarranted	
20		insight into Google's product strategy, evaluation, and internal problem-solving procedures, which	
21		would enable them to unfairly compete with	
		Google.	
22	Ex. 27 (GOOG-	GOOG-WEEKS-00191658 reveals confidential	Seal proposed
23	WEEKS- 00191658)	strategic decisions related to marketing and pricing of the Pixels. Public disclosure of this sensitive	redactions
24	00171030)	business information would harm Google's	
25		competitive standing because it would give competitors unwarranted insight into Google's	
26		marketing and pricing strategies, allowing them to	
27		unfairly benefit from Google's know-how and the resources it expended to launch and promote the	
		Pixel9_	
28		D] ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAL MA' I GOOGLE'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR	

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
	ıl

Exhibits to Declaration of Bobbie Wilson ISO Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Motion ("Wilson Decl.")	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
Ex. 28 (GOOG-WEEKS-00002551-2552)	GOOG-WEEKS-00002551-2552 contains confidential information relating to the confidential analysis undertaken by Google to ascertain the cause of microphone issues experienced by certain customers. The results of Google's confidential analysis disclose Google's research efforts and technical know-how relating to the Pixels, which is proprietary business information. Public disclosure of these details could harm Google's competitive standing because its competitors could benefit from unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy, testing results, and internal problem-solving procedures, which would enable them to unfairly compete with Google.	Seal proposed redactions

Declaration of	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
Steven James ISO		
Google's Opp. to		
Plaintiffs' Motion		
("James Decl.")		
Redacted portions	These portions of the James Decl. disclose	Seal proposed
of ¶¶ 5, 7-10, 17	strategic decisions related to Google's internal	redactions
(& n.1), 18	testing processes, procedures, the confidential	
	analysis undertaken by Google to ascertain the	
	cause of microphone issues experienced by certain	
	customers, as well as the results of internal testing	
	(by Google and HTC) and analysis of the Pixels,	
	which includes disclosure of Google's return data	
	and failure rate projections for the Pixels. This	
	information is proprietary and confidential to	
	Google. Public disclosure of this confidential	
	information would harm Google's competitive	
	standing because its competitors would benefit	
	from unwarranted insight into Google's product	
	strategy, evaluation, testing methodologies, testing	
	results, and internal problem-solving procedures,	
	which would enable them to unfairly compete	
	with Google10-	
[PROPOSET	DORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAL MAT	FERIALS SUBMITTED IN

1	Declaration of	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
2	Steven James ISO		
3	Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Motion ("James Decl.")		
4	Redacted portions	These portions of the James Decl. disclose	Seal proposed
5	of ¶¶ 12-14, 16	strategic decisions related to Google's internal testing processes and procedures, the confidential	redactions
6		analysis undertaken by Google to ascertain the cause of microphone issues experienced by certain	
7		customers, as well as the results of Google's internal testing and analysis of the Pixels. These	
8		portions of the James Decl. also disclose	
9		confidential technical details relating to Google's proposed and actual corrective action(s) taken	
10		with respect to the Pixels. The results of Google's confidential analysis and the related technical	
11		details reveal Google's research efforts and technical know-how relating to the Pixels, which	
12		is proprietary business information.	
13			
14		These redacted paragraphs also cite to or otherwise pull information from Ex. B to the	
15		James Decl., which Google has designated as "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential -	
16		Attorneys' Eyes Only" pursuant to the parties' Stipulated Protective Order, because of the	
17 18		competitively-sensitive nature of the information contained therein. Google seeks to seal Ex. B to	
19		the James Decl. in its entirety for the reasons set forth below.	
20		Public disclosure of this confidential information	
21		would harm Google's competitive standing because its competitors would benefit from	
22		unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy, evaluation, testing methodologies, testing	
23		results, and internal problem-solving procedures, which would enable them to unfairly compete	
24		with Google.	
25	Ex. A	Ex. A, James Decl. reveals highly confidential	Seal proposed
26		details relating to the pre-release testing	redactions
27		performed on the Pixels, including but not limited to specific details relating to testing conditions,	
		status of outstanding issues, failure analyses,	
28	[PROPOSED	ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAL MAT	FERIALS SUBMITTED IN

1	Declaration of	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
2 3	Steven James ISO Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Motion ("James Decl.")		
4	(James Deci.)	action items, and factory yields. Ex. A, James	
5		Decl. has been designated by Google as "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential -	
6		Attorneys' Eyes Only" pursuant to the parties' Stipulated Protective Order, because of the	
7		competitively-sensitive nature of the information contained therein.	
8 9		Public disclosure of Ex. A, James Decl. could harm Google's competitive standing because it	
10		would provide competitive standing because it would provide competitors unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy, and HTC's	
11		manufacturing processes and testing results, which would allow competitors to unfairly benefit from	
12		Google's and HTC's know-how, research, and resources expended to launch the Pixels.	
13	Ex. B	Ex. B, James Decl. discloses strategic decisions related to Google's internal testing processes and	Seal proposed redactions
14 15		procedures, the confidential analysis undertaken by Google to ascertain the cause of microphone	
16		issues experienced by certain customers, as well as the results of Google's internal testing and	
17		analysis of the Pixels. Ex. B, James Decl. also discloses confidential technical details relating to	
18		Google's proposed and actual corrective action(s) taken with respect to the Pixels. The results of	
19		Google's confidential analysis and the related technical details reveal Google's research efforts	
20		and technical know-how relating to the Pixels, which is proprietary business information.	
21		Ex. B, James Decl. has been designated by Google	
22		as "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only" pursuant to the parties'	
24		Stipulated Protective Order, because of the competitively-sensitive nature of the information	
25		contained therein.	
26		Public disclosure of this confidential information would harm Google's competitive standing	
27		because its competitors would benefit from unwarranted insight into Google's product	
28		ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAL MATERIAL GOOGLE'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27

28

Declaration of Steven James ISO Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Motion ("James Decl.")	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
	strategy, evaluation, testing methodologies, testing results, and internal problem-solving procedures, which would enable them to unfairly compete with Google.	

Declaration	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
of Steven		
Nickel ISO		
Google's		
Opp. to		
Plaintiffs'		
Motion		
("Nickel		
Decl.")		
Redacted	These portions of the Nickel Decl. disclose strategic	Seal proposed
portions of	decisions related to Google's internal testing processes	redactions
¶¶ 5-9	and procedures, the confidential analysis undertaken by	
	Google to ascertain the cause of microphone issues	
	experienced by certain customers, as well as the results	
	of Google's internal testing and analysis of the Pixels.	
	These portions of the Nickel Decl. also disclose	
	confidential technical details relating to Google's	
	proposed and actual corrective action(s) taken with	
	respect to the Pixels. The results of Google's	
	confidential analysis and the related technical details	
	reveal Google's research efforts and technical know-	
	how relating to the Pixels, which is proprietary business	
	information.	
	Public disclosure of this confidential information would	
	harm Google's competitive standing because its	
	competitors would benefit from unwarranted insight	
	into Google's product strategy, evaluation, testing	
	methodologies, testing results, and internal problem-	
	solving procedures, which would enable them to	
	unfairly compete with Google.	
Redacted	These portions of the Nickel Decl. disclose confidential	Seal proposed
portions of	technical details relating to Google's proposed and	redactions
¶¶ 10-13	actual corrective action(s) taken with respect to the	
	Pixels. The results of Google's confidential analysis and	
	the related technical details reveal Google's research	
[PROF	ceffort sanderechnical know drow relating to the dixele, MA	FERIALS SUBMITTED IN

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Declaration of Steven Nickel ISO Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Motion ("Nickel Decl.")	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
	which is proprietary business information. Public disclosure of this confidential information would harm Google's competitive standing because its competitors would benefit from unwarranted insight into Google's product strategy, evaluation, testing methodologies, testing results, and internal problemsolving procedures, which would enable them to unfairly compete with Google.	

Declaration of	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
John		
Tuchtenhagen		
Decl. ISO		
Google's Opp.		
to Plaintiffs'		
Motion		
("Tuchtenhagen		
Decl.")		
Redacted	These portions of the Tuchtenhagen Decl. disclose	Seal proposed
portions of ¶¶ 4-	confidential strategic decisions related to marketing	redactions
6	of the Pixels. Public disclosure of this sensitive	
	business information would harm Google's	
	competitive standing because it would give	
	competitors unwarranted insight into Google's	
	marketing strategies, allowing them to unfairly	
	benefit from Google's know-how and the resources it	
	expended to launch and promote the Pixel.	

	Declaration of	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
	Lily Lin ISO		
	Google's Opp.		
	to Plaintiffs'		
	Motion ("Lin		
	Decl.")		
	Redacted	These portions of the Lin Decl. disclose confidential	Seal proposed
_	portions of ¶¶ 4-	strategic decisions related to marketing of the Pixels.	redactions
	TPROPOS	EDFORDER GRANTING GOOGLE'S MOTION TO SEAT MAT	ERTALS SUBMITTED IN I

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Declaration of Lily Lin ISO Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Motion ("Lin Decl.")	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
5	Public disclosure of this sensitive business information would harm Google's competitive standing because it would give competitors unwarranted insight into Google's marketing strategies, allowing them to unfairly benefit from Google's know-how and the resources it expended to launch and promote the Pixel. Additionally, ¶ 5 reveals confidential personal information of Google employees.	

Declaration of Rossa Hsieh ISO Google's Opp. to Plaintiffs' Motion ("Hsieh Decl.")	Justification for Sealing	Court's Ruling
Redacted portions of ¶¶ 5-7	These portions of the Hsieh Decl. disclose confidential strategic decisions related to marketing of the Pixels. Public disclosure of this sensitive business information would harm Google's competitive standing because it would give competitors unwarranted insight into Google's marketing strategies, allowing them to unfairly benefit from Google's know-how and the resources it expended to launch and promote the Pixel.	Seal proposed redactions

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____ HON. NATHANAEL COUSINS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE